



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,709	06/19/2001	Timothy L. Timmerman SR.		4077

7590 03/07/2003

IRELL & MANELLA LLP
Suite 900
1800 Avenue of the Stars
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

HORTON, YVONNE MICHELE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

Office Action SummaryApplication No.
09/884,709Applicant(s)
TIMOTHY L. TIMMERMANExaminer
YVONNE M. HORTONArt Unit
3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 17, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

Art Unit: 3635

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. The claims stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over the claims of U. S. Patent No. 6,158,184, as listed below, since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Art Unit: 3635

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

A rigid rectangular structural panel having a plurality of attachment points, a plurality of foundation bolts, a foundation template, and a means for attaching the structural panel hold down points to the foundation bolts.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent.

The Instant Application

US Patent #6,158,184

1	1
2	1
3	1
4	1,2
5	1
6	5
7	5
9-11	1,4

Art Unit: 3635

Claims 1-4,6 and 7 stand rejected over US Patent #6,158,184 to TIMMERMAN, Sr. et al. TIMMERMAN, Sr. et al. Teaches that it is known in the art to a rigid panel including a plurality of holdown attachment points, a plurality of foundation bolts, a foundation placement template, and a means for attaching the structural panel hold down points to the foundation bolts.

Regarding claim 2, the means for attaching includes a plurality of holdowns. In reference to claim 3, the rigid panel is rectangularly shaped and includes two vertical side members connected to two or more horizontal members to form an opening, a plurality of attachment points, and one or more lateral resisting members. Regarding claim 4, the one or more lateral resisting members are horizontal spacers forming subopenings wherein the subopenings are covered by panels at vertical joints. In reference to claims 6 and 7, TIMMERMAN, Sr. et al. further teaches the use of a plurality of rectangular panels attached to the vertical members by fasteners.

Claim 5 stands rejected over US #6,158,184 to TIMMERMAN, Sr. et al. in view of US #5,706,626 to MUELLER. As detailed above, TIMMERMAN, Sr. et al. teaches the basic claimed apparatus except for forming the lateral force resisting members from metal. MUELLER teaches that it is known in the art to form the rigid structure out of a metal material, column 2, line 59, and specifically teaches forming lateral force resisting members out of metal.. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the system of US #6,158,184 out of a metal material, as taught by US #5,706,626 in order to create a stronger apparatus that will have greater resistance to buckling and bending under applied forces.

Art Unit: 3635

Claims 9-11 stand rejected over US #6,158,184 to TIMMERMAN, Sr. et al. in view of US #5,706,626 to MUELLER. TIMMERMAN teaches the basic claimed apparatus except for explicitly detailing load points and a pattern therefore. MUELLER teaches that it is known in the art to apply a force at certain locations. This location would hereby be a load point. Although US #5,706,626 only shows two of these particular points, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a load could be applied at any or various points about and throughout the structure in various patterns. Thus the pattern of load points is a design characteristic that depends upon the material used to form the apparatus, the environment in which the device is to be used, and the type of load being applied thereon.

Drawings

3. The drawings stand objected to because there are no Figures 1A, 1B, 2A or 2B. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings remains required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "load points (515)" or "panel (532)". A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

Art Unit: 3635

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the first paragraph of the specification must be amended to include that application serial number 09/697,030 is now abandoned. Appropriate correction is required.

6. The specification stands objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: There is no support in the specification for the “linear patterns” and “parallel linear patterns” of claims 8-11. The specification on page 12 lines 4-8 only details that the load points have suitable shapes...such as...squares, rectangle, ovals and circles...and may be arranged in patterns. There is nothing in the specification supporting “linear patterns” and “parallel linear patterns”. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Claims 1-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent #5,706,626 to MUELLER. MUELLER discloses a rigid panel (100) including a plurality of holdown attachment points (132), a plurality of foundation bolts (166,172), a foundation placement template (106), a means (134) for attaching the structural panel hold down points to the foundation bolts, and a plurality of load points (unlabeled) distributed throughout a plurality of lateral force resisting members (140), column 9, lines 5-8. Due to the fact that lateral members (140) resist force, inherently, load points are located throughout/therealong to reduce the tendency of buckling. Regarding claim 2, the means for attaching includes a plurality of

Art Unit: 3635

holdowns (130). In reference to claim 3, the rigid panel is rectangularly shaped and includes two vertical side members (102a,b) connected to two or more horizontal members (104,106) to form an opening (outlined red), see the marked attachment, a plurality of attachment points (132), and, as noted earlier, a plurality of load points (unlabeled) distributed throughout one or more lateral resisting members (140). Due to the fact that lateral members (140) resist force, inherently, load points are located throughout/therealong to reduce the tendency of buckling, column 9, lines 5-8. Regarding claim 4, the one or more lateral resisting members (140) are horizontal spacers forming subopenings (outlined blue), see the marked attachment, wherein the subopenings are covered by panels (110a,b) at vertical joints. In reference to claim 5, the lateral force resisting member (140) is metal, column 2, line 59. Regarding claim 6, the panels (110) include a plurality of panels (110a,110b). In reference to claim 7, the panels are attached using a plurality of fasteners (124). In reference to claim 9, the structure of MUELLER includes a plurality of load (182,184) applied to the apparatus; wherein the loads (182,182) inherently create a linear pattern of load points (unlabeled) along the lateral force resisting members (140) because the force appears to be applied normal thereto. Force applied normally to a structure at a desired location is distributed linearly throughout.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
10. Claim 10 is and claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #5,706,626 to MUELLER. As detailed above, MUELLER discloses the basic

Art Unit: 3635

claimed panel except for an indication of the load points including specifically a linear pattern or a parallel linear pattern. Although MUELLER does not specifically detail load points distributed in a linear pattern or a parallel linear pattern, he does teach the use of loads applied linearly at a top portion of the panel. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a load could be applied at any or various points about the structure. The resulting pattern of load points depends upon the material used to form the apparatus, the environment in which the device is to be used, the type of load being applied, and the angle at which the load is applied thereon. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the loads applied to MUELLER could be distributed throughout and thereabout forming any number of patterns including linear and parallel linear pattern. Linear patterns are most likely the result of more evenly disposed loads and other patterns are more likely the result of more unevenly applied loads.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 12/17/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because although MUELLER does not explicitly discuss load points, he does detail that his lateral members (140) reduce the tendency of the panel to buckle under an applied load. The ability of a member to do such is an example of the "ductility" of the member. Also, a load applied at any location is distributed throughout at various points thereby being designated as "load points. Hence, MUELLER inherently details the use of load points in a force resisting member.

Art Unit: 3635


Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne M. Horton whose telephone number is (703) 308-1909.


YMH
Art Unit 3635
March 4, 2003


Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600